DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 680 TM 024 002

AUTHOR Wilder, Gita Z.
TITLE The Role of the Mentor Teacher: A Two-Phase Study of Teacher Mentoring Programs. Teacher Programs Council Research Report Series.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY Teacher Programs Council.
REPORT NO ETS-RR-92-21
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interprofessional Relationship; Interviews; *Mentors; *Professional Development; *Program Development; State Legislation; *Teacher Role; Telephone Surveys

ABSTRACT

Increasing attention to mentoring in the teaching profession in recent years has been accompanied by a proliferation of programs, literature and expertise related to experienced teachers helping new teachers. To assess the extent to which there is a common set of functions performed by teacher mentors, a two-phase study of mentoring was undertaken. In the first phase, a telephone survey of the 50 states and of more than 100 districts was conducted to gather data about the existence and nature of mentoring programs. The survey revealed that about 60 percent of the states have enacted legislation to create formal programs of mentoring, although many of the programs had not yet been implemented at the time of the survey. In addition, mentoring programs existed in districts without state programs. In the second phase of the study, visits were made to eight mentoring programs, selected to represent a range of sponsorship and program structures. Interviews were conducted with program, district, and school administrators, and with mentors and their teacher-proteges. The results suggest that, although mentoring programs differ with respect to the ways in which the work of mentors is structured, there are functions that are common to the role of mentor across programs. The common functions and the implications of these for selecting and training mentors are discussed. Three tables present survey findings. An appendix contains questions for the site groups. (Contains 39 references.) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

RR-92-21

Teacher Programs Council Research Report Series

ED 384 680

THE ROLE OF THE MENTOR TEACHER: A TWO-PHASE STUDY OF TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAMS

Gita Z. Wilder

The research in this series was undertaken at the request of and funded by the Teacher Programs Council

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

No. 92-1

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Coley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Educational Testing Service
Educational Policy Research Division
Princeton, New Jersey 08541

April 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM024002

Copyright © 1992. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

Errata

The Role of the Mentor Teacher:

A Two-Phase Study of Teacher Mentoring Programs

(Educational Testing Service Research Report 92-21)

Gita Z. Wilder

April 1992

Page 4: Tables 1 and 2 insertion should be deleted.

Page 13: Table 3 insertion should be deleted.

THE ROLE OF THE MENTOR TEACHER: A TWO-PHASE STUDY OF TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAMS

Gita Z. Wilder[1]

Abstract

Increasing attention to mentoring in the teaching profession in recent years has been accompanied by a proliferation of programs, literature and expertise related to experienced teachers helping new teachers. To assess the extent to which there is a common set of functions performed by teacher mentors, a two-phase study of mentoring was undertaken. In the first phase, a telephone survey of the 50 states and of more than 100 districts was conducted to gather data about the existence and nature of mentoring programs. The survey revealed that about 60 percent of the states have enacted legislation to create formal programs of mentoring, although many of the programs had not yet been implemented at the time of the survey. In addition, mentoring programs existed in districts without state programs. In the second phase of the study, visits were made to eight mentoring programs, selected to represent a range of sponsorship and program structures. Interviews were conducted with program, district and school administrators, and with mentors and their teacher-proteges. The results suggest that, although mentoring programs differ with respect to the ways in which the work of mentors is structured, there are functions that are common to the role of mentor across programs. The common functions and the implications of these for selecting and training mentors are discussed.

---

[1]The author is indebted to Caryn J. Ashare, who conducted the telephone survey, took part in most of the site visits, and compiled the information that provides the basis for many of the conclusions derived in this report.

THE ROLE OF THE MENTOR TEACHER: A TWO-PHASE STUDY OF TEACHER MENTORING PROGRAMS

Gita Z. Wilder[1]

Introduction

Although mentoring is a practice that has long been observed in many professions, it has only recently received formal attention in the teaching profession. This is not to suggest that teachers who are new to the profession have not enjoyed the support of mentors in the past; it is simply that such support was typically a function of relationships forged between individuals, usually without formal sanction.

Two relatively recent trends in education have contributed to a new emphasis on mentoring in the profession. The first is the growth of support programs for preservice and inservice teachers; the second is the set of interrelated initiatives aimed at reforming schools and their organization. The first acknowledges the needs of new (and often experienced) teachers for help from a variety of sources, not the least of these individuals who have become successful at the art of teaching. The second includes a range of recommended changes aimed at changing the climate of schools and of the teaching profession. Included in the reforms are goals of increasing "empowerment", collegiality, and responsibility for the state of the profession among teachers.

Along with the focus of attention on mentoring among teachers, literature had developed and proliferated. There is a small but growing number of "experts" on mentoring (e.g., Galvez-Hjornevik, Gehrke, Huling-Austin, Odell, and Thies-Sprinthall, to name a number who have authored multiple articles on the topic), and an expanding body of publications that range from treatises on how to be a mentor (e.g., Schulman & Colbert, 1988) through assessments of mentoring efforts (Huling-Austin & Murphy, 1987).

To characterize this growing (and therefore changing) body of literature is perhaps foolish. Nonetheless, it is useful to differentiate among more general approaches that are conceptual or descriptive in nature (e.g., Jung, 1986; Weber, 1987; Simpher & Rieger, 1988); the advisory or "how-to" approaches that guide audiences through such specifies as setting up programs of mentoring, selecting and training mentors, and supporting mentors in the performance of their various functions (e.g., Barnes & Murphy, 1987; Brzoska, et. al., 1987; Driscoll, et. al., 1985; Schulman & Colbert, 1988) and the evaluative approaches that attempt some assessment of the

---

[1]The author is indebted to Caryn J. Ashare, who conducted the telephone survey, took part in most of the site visits, and compiled the information that provides the basis for many of the conclusions derived in this report.

efficacy of mentoring at either the individual or collective level (e.g., Butler, 1987; Holmes, 1986; Huling-Austin & Murphy, 1987). The first of these often examine the phenomenon of mentoring in professions other than teaching as well as in teaching; the role of the mentor in teaching; and the import of mentoring for both the individuals (mentors and proteges) involved and the professions in which mentoring takes place. The second span a range from descriptions of particular mentoring programs that are intended to guide others in developing such programs through actual guidebooks on different aspects of the mentoring process: setting up programs, defining the role of the mentor, selecting mentors, assigning mentors, training mentors, and evaluating mentors. The third report on attempts to assess the effectiveness of individual mentors and/or programs of mentoring on such variables as the satisfaction levels of those who are mentored, the retention rates of beginning teachers in schools or districts in which mentoring takes place, and the performance ratings of teachers who have had mentors.

Throughout the literature, even where caveats are offered and specific failures are documented, the general conclusions appear to be that everyone involved in the mentoring process evaluates it positively in its general manifestation. That is, district and school administrators, even those who initially opposed the establishment of particular forms of mentoring, positively assess the influence of mentoring on a variety of outcomes. These include the efficiency of their own work, the induction of new teachers, the quality of teaching in schools, the retention of new teachers, and the climate of schools and of the profession. Teachers who have been mentored invariably attest to the helpfulness of the process. Such critical comments as do emerge tend to revolve around the need for more mentoring than is provided, or more attention from mentors whose attentions are divided among a number of proteges. Moreover, the mentors themselves, while occasionally identifying structural flaws in their programs, are almost universal in the testimony they provide about the value of the process to them, personally and professionally. Mentoring appears to enhance self-esteem and collegiality, enthusiasm for teaching, and reflectiveness among those who act as mentors, to name only a few of the themes that recur among mentors' accounts of their experiences.

Some of the most recent reports have attempted to generalize from the experiences of mentors and of mentoring programs, to create a knowledge base for mentoring (e.g., Bey & Holmes, 1990). Whether such efforts will ultimately prove useful in either the heuristic or practical sense, or both, remains to be seen.

Project Background

This report describes a two-phase effort to understand mentoring in the teaching profession. The first phase took the form of a survey of mentoring programs conducted in 1989. The purpose of the survey were (1) to describe the extent and variety of programs across the country in which experienced teachers serve as mentors to other teachers, and (2) to learn what is common to the role of mentor as it is defined in different settings. Phase 2 represented an attempt to get beyond the formal documents

and statements of programs about the official functions of mentors to learn what duties they actually performed, how their roles fit into larger programs of teacher induction and/or school reform, and how program administrators, the mentors themselves, and their proteges evaluated the mentoring activities in the context of program goals.

The initial survey involved telephone calls to the 50 states and selected districts about the existence and nature of mentoring programs therein. The second phase involved visits to eight sites, and included visits to administrative offices, schools and training facilities; and interviews with selected individuals. Both phases focused on describing the role of the mentor and the varying contexts in which the role of the mentor was performed.

In the pages that follow, the activities and findings of the two phases are described separately. Then the results from both phases are discussed.

Phase 1: The Telephone Survey

Goals

The purpose of the first phase was to describe the extent and nature of mentoring activity in the United States during the first half of 1989. Mentoring activity in this context refers to programs in which experienced teachers act in the role of mentor or coach to other, usually newer or less effective, teachers. A search of the literature on mentoring revealed considerable confusion among programs in terminology and usage. States and districts that reported having mentoring programs differed considerably in what they meant by the term and in how they defined the roles and responsibilities of the mentors. For this reason, the survey focused on the role, regardless of the label.

Methods

The first phase incorporated four major activities; a search and review of the literature on mentoring; a telephone survey of the 50 state departments of education; a telephone survey of selected districts; and an analysis of documents that were collected from states and districts in the course of the other activities.

Representatives of each of the 50 state departments of education and of the District of Columbia were surveyed by telephone, using a semi-structured interview protocol. Each representative was asked whether there was a mentoring initiative at the state level and, if there was, for copies of documents related to the initiative. Documents collected in this process included descriptions of programs, legislation and/or guidelines; selection criteria for mentor teachers; job descriptions for mentor teachers; publications related to the initiatives; and evaluation reports.

Seventy districts were also surveyed by telephone. The districts were mainly in

states in which no state-level program existed at the time of the survey, or in which particularly active or innovative programs had been identified through the literature search or by the state department representative. (The goal was to be as inclusive as possible of the range and variety of mentoring programs.) Again, using a semi-structured protocol, the interviewer asked the district representatives about the nature and extent of mentoring activity in the district and about the roles of mentors. Districts also provided documents and reports related to their programs.

The documents accumulated through the literature search and survey were analyzed and summarized. The analysis focused on how the role of the mentor was defined and carried out. Information about the mentoring role was abstracted from four major data sources: accounts of the selection criteria for mentors; job descriptions or descriptions of the tasks performed by mentors; manuals and other materials used in the training of mentors; and descriptions from evaluation procedures or reports about how success in mentoring is or might be defined.

Findings

At the time of the survey in 1989, 28 states had state-level initiatives involving mentoring as defined here. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the state-level activity and, in

<INSERT TABLES 1 AND 2 ABOUT HERE>

states in which programs existed, catalogs key features of the programs. For example, in at least four of the states with state-level programs there were district-level initiatives that predated the state effort. Seven of the state-level initiatives were pilot programs which did or did not become full-blown efforts. An additional four states were planning pilot programs that had not yet started. In 14 states, the mentoring programs were tied to certification and/or the tenure process.

In many of the states with no mentoring activity at the level of the state department of education there were district-level programs, just as there were district-level programs in some states that preceded the involvement of the state departments of education.

Mentoring programs may be one component of larger efforts at educational reform in the state. In several states, mentoring took place solely in the context of alternative certification programs. In 15 states, mentoring programs involved cooperation with institutions of higher education or teacher training institutions.

States also differ with respect to the involvement of mentors in the process of evaluation. In some states, the mentor functioned solely in a supportive role. In at least four states, the mentor's sole function was evaluation. Between these two extremes were the majority of states in which mentors served both support and evaluation functions.

There are several different models with respect to the participation of mentors in evaluation. In the rare case, a mentor may evaluate a new teacher for certification or licensing. (Such involvement is often a sensitive issue with teachers' unions). More commonly, a mentor may collect information (referred to as "formative evaluation") in preparation for a later, summative evaluation. The information may or may not refer to the protege's attainment of specific competencies required by the state for licensing or certification.

In some states, there are support teams, rather than individual mentors. Typically, support teams include building administrators or other personnel in addition to the mentor teacher. In such cases, the mentor's role is usually to provide day-to-day support for the protege, and/or to collect formative evaluative information on an ongoing basis while other members of the team, or the team acting in concert, serve(s) the summative evaluation function.

Programs vary with respect to whether or not the mentor is remunerated and/or whether or not the mentor is given release time for mentoring activities; these differences con affect the specific tasks that mentoring perform.

Mentor selection. The selection of mentors varies by state. On the one hand, the process may be highly specified at the state level. On the other hand, it may be left to individual districts to make selections based on their own guidelines or within broad state process and the districts develop their own specifications.

Criteria also vary. While some programs allow administrators to be mentors, most specify teachers. Most programs require that the candidate be certified in the state, and a small number require that the mentor be tenured. Most also specify some minimum level of teaching experience, which varies from one to seven years. Many require a high degree of demonstrated skill as a classroom teacher, the criteria for which may be unspecified or involve recommendations of building administrators or peers, or actual evaluations over the past several years. In several programs, mentors must have Masters degrees, and in others, there are requirements couched in terms of hours of professional development. In some of the programs where certification involves specific competencies, mentor teacher candidates must have demonstrated these competencies to qualify.

Many states require applicants to demonstrate their willingness to serve as mentors. Many require qualities like the ability to supervise, observe, and relate to younger people. Frequently, mentors are required to fulfill specific conditions like teaching in the same subject area or grade or being located in the same building as the protege.

Training of mentors. States and districts vary with respect to the type and amount of training they provide mentors and, in fact, whether they train mentors at all. There are also, according to the respondents at the state level, variations within states where training is not centralized, with respect to the existence, the nature, the content and the quality of the training. In some states, the training of mentors is delivered by teacher training organizations; in a few states (Florida is an example), there are Teacher Centers in which the training takes place; while in others there is no single mechanism for the training, and training is not a project component.

In the states where there are specific competencies in which mentor teachers will be supporting proteges (e.g., Arizona, Florida, North Carolina), the training emphasizes these competencies. Sometimes training includes instruction in using specific evaluation criteria or in the use of a state- or district-mandated instrument.

Commonly-listed topics for training include: effective teaching; observing; classroom management; curriculum planning; conferencing; working with adult learners; supervision; and support techniques. Some training time is usually devoted to the responsibilities and expectations of mentors.

Tasks of mentors. The major sources of information about the tasks performed by mentors were (1) the literature on mentoring, both in fields other than teaching, and within the teaching profession; (2) descriptions of the selection criteria for mentor teachers at both the state and district levels; and (3) lists of the responsibilities of mentors provided in the descriptions of state and district-level programs. Other sources that were consulted in developing the role description of mentor teachers were individuals with some experience either in the development and/or administration of mentor programs or the training of mentor teachers; manuals and guides for the training of mentors; and descriptions of the needs of beginning teachers that appear in research on beginning teachers and in accounts of teacher induction programs.

This information was examined to determine the degree of overlap among the various functions, tasks, and responsibilities. A content analysis of the collected tasks of mentors mentioned in job descriptions revealed that these fell into three major categories:

- professional support (socialization to the profession):
- technical support; and
- personal support.

States in which mentors take part in the process of evaluating beginning teacher include an additional set of tasks in their listings. These tasks specify the functions performed by mentors for the purpose of assessment and evaluation. Finally, there is a

series of additional miscellaneous tasks that mentors perform in particular states.

Within these broad categories, all of which are represented to some extent in the roles of the mentors in programs included in the survey, there are verbs that appear with considerable regularity. These are: assisting, guiding, modeling, advising, instructing, demonstrating, coaching, observing, supporting, meeting, documenting, providing feedback, helping with a range of functions that include specific techniques; identifying, locating, and obtaining resources; planning curriculum; attaining and demonstrating competencies; managing; preparing for evaluation; and, as noted earlier, assessing or evaluating. A composite list of the tasks performed by mentors in the 28 states with state-level programs appears in the Appendix.

Discussion

The survey provided comparative information across states and selected districts about mentoring programs and the roles of mentors. Across programs, it appeared that mentors performed similar functions, even when programs varied.

Conversations with individuals involved in mentoring programs and research on mentoring identified a number of additional issues that modify any conclusions that can be drawn from paper accounts of the mentoring function.

Many of the mentoring programs represented in program descriptions with remarkably specific accounts of selection criteria and responsibilities existed, in fact, only on paper. This was most often the case in the state-level programs. The extent to which mentoring programs had actually been implemented varied considerably from state to state among the states that have programs "on the books," so to speak, and from district to district within those states. Several programs are of long standing. Those in Toledo, Ohio and in Rochester, New York are cases in point that pre-date the state-level initiatives in those states. At the other extreme, some programs existed only as descriptions at the time of the survey either because there was no funding for implementation or because pilot efforts had yet to be evaluated so that decisions about implementation could be made.

Little was known about how well mentoring was working. One reason seemed to be that the objectives of mentoring programs were not always clear. A second is that, even where objectives were specified, there was little information about whether mentoring programs really were successful in achieving these goals. There was also little information about whether the selection criteria adopted by programs identified successful mentors; about whether the tasks assigned to mentors were actually the most appropriate functions for them; and about whether and to what extent mentors actually performed the tasks that are specified. And, finally, there was very little in the way of systematic information about how to define and assess success in mentoring.

Lists of tasks and responsibilities convey little of the flavor of the more descriptive accounts and the clinical nature of the mentoring enterprise. These stress the interpersonal aspects of mentoring, and the importance of the match between mentor and protege. Research studies have typically identified psychosocial qualities that characterize good mentors (e.g., flexibility, supportiveness, and enthusiasm). These qualities do not lend themselves to listing in job descriptions, nor are they easily assessed.

There is considerable disagreement in the literature (and, as noted previously, little data) about many of the issue related to mentoring. For example, there appears to be disagreement about whether mentoring in teaching is a different enterprise from mentoring in other professions. And, although there is general agreement about the importance of the match between mentor and protege, there is disagreement about how the match is best made. For example, there is disagreement about whether it is important for mentors to teach the same subject, the same grade, and/or in the same building as their proteges in order to function as effective mentors; whether same-sex pairing is important; and whether or not it is necessary for mentor and protege to share ideologies about teaching approaches and/or classroom management.

Much of what is written about mentoring suggests that there is a life cycle to the mentoring relationship. As the protege becomes more experienced and self-confident as a teacher, his/her needs changes and the type of support he/she requires from a mentor apparently changes as well. Because the mentoring relationships created by the programs of mentoring in teaching are generally short-lived, there is little evidence available either to support or refute the notion of a life cycle. There is also little guidance available from existing programs about how the mentor's behavior needs to change over the course of the relationship.

These observations generated questions about how mentoring programs were actually implemented, as opposed to how they were represented on paper and in official accounts. Phase 2 was designed with this interest in mind.

Phase 2: Visits to Eight Sites

Goals

The purpose of Phase 2 was to get beyond the information that had been gleaned from conversations with state and district representatives and from documents, and gain some perspective on how mentors actually functioned. It had become clear, in conversation with program administrators, that the documents were not always accurate reflections of what mentors did. Nor had the conversations with state and district officials provided mentors' or proteges' accounts of what mentors did and how well they performed their functions. For these reasons, visits were planned to a small number of sites in which interviews could be arranged with a number of different individuals

connected with mentoring.

Specifically, the goals of Phase 2 were (once again) to ascertain the central, defining features of the role of mentor; and to describe the major variations that occur among mentoring programs in both the functions that mentors perform and the ways in which their roles are structured.

Specific topics addressed

Recognizing that a program of mentoring was the unit of observation for the study, a series of topics was devised around which to organize the data collection at each site. These topics included:

- The structure and orientation of the mentoring program
- The background, history, and philosophy of the program and its implementation at each site
- The context, including the administrative structures involved in the definition and deployment of mentors
- The processes and individuals involved in selecting, training, supervising and evaluating mentors
- The official and actual functions of mentors
- The evaluation, formal and informal, of the success of individual mentors and of the program
- Plans for the future of the program

Each topic or variable suggested a set of questions that could be asked at each site of the individuals included to elicit descriptions of the conditions of interest.

Methods

On the basis of the information supplied by states and districts, a rough clustering of mentoring programs was developed in order to characterize them according to differences in the ways in which mentors function, and/or in the contexts in which the mentoring programs exist. Then, a small number of programs were selected for site visits. The programs were selected to exemplify some of the major variations among mentoring programs.

Visits were made to eight programs during the 1989-90 school year. With a single

exception, each site was visited by at least two individuals; several sites were visited by three. Typically, the team spent two or three days at a site, interviewing program administrators, district- and/or school-level administrators in whose districts or schools mentoring was taking place, trainers of mentors, mentors themselves, and teachers who were being mentored. Wherever possible, members of the site visit team attempted to observe mentors doing some of what their role required: working with beginning teachers, providing or receiving training, and meeting about their shared tasks or concerns.

The selection of sites

The goal in selecting the eight sites was to provide a range of settings across which major variations in the mentor role might be observed. On the basis of what was learned from the initial survey, the goal was to provide programs that together provided contrasts with respect to the following:

- whether or not mentors are released from full-time teaching in order to serve as mentors
- who mentors serve: beginning teachers, teachers new to districts, experienced teachers
- whether or not mentors participate in the evaluation process for beginning (or other) teachers
- sponsorship of programs: state, district, other organization
- whether or not the program is connected to an institution of higher education
- age of program (e.g., new and established programs)
- the processes of selecting, assigning and training mentors

It was also deemed important to include at least one program that had served as a model for other programs.

With these concerns in mind, the following eight sites were chosen for inclusion in the study:

- A program in a large state in the far West that was experimenting with new performance assessments of teachers and planned variations in types of programs using mentors. Co-existing with the local variations was a large-scale, state-wide voluntary program of mentoring. In this state, three

different districts were visited in order to sample the range of variation that existed among programs within the state guidelines.

- A northeastern state in which the year of the site visit was the initial year in the implementation of a program state-wide that introduced major changes in the induction and evaluation of beginning teachers, following several years of pilot-testing. The mentoring function in the state was tied to performance assessment and certification, and involved substantial state support and extensive training of mentors.

- A program in a southern state in which the state was responsible for choosing mentors and pairing them with proteges. The state had developed its own performance assessment system for teachers.

- One of a number of different programs of mentoring co-existing in a major northeastern city, the program visited was sponsored by the strong teachers' union in the city. The program had been in existence for a number of years at the time of the visit. It included a program evaluation component.

- A program that appeared, in the initial survey, to have been the most fully developed state-level effort. It included performance assessment, certification of mentors, and a career ladder for teachers.

- A district-level program in a medium-sized eastern city that had garnered considerable national publicity and served as a model for several other programs (including another that was included in this study). It was notable for the collaboration it had achieved between the superintendent's office and the teacher's union.

- A program of long standing in a medium-sized city in the southwest that is one of a small number nation-wide included as model programs in a study conducted by Michigan State University. The program involves a graduate internship for beginning teachers, in which proteges can earn graduate credit. Mentors are released full-time.

- A district-level program in a large eastern city in which mentors are released full time for two years. The mentors evaluate beginning teachers for certification. Beginning teachers can earn graduate credit through a college consortium.

The planning and conduct of the site visits

Arranging for a site visit started with a call to the individual who had been the program contact at the time of the initial survey to describe the study and its objectives

and to initiate procedures for obtaining permission to visit. A second step involved identifying and setting up appointments with some or all of the following categories of individuals: program and state or district administrators; principals or administrators of buildings in which mentoring is taking place; mentors; beginning teachers, including some - if there were any -- who were NOT being served by mentors; trainers of mentors; other individuals (if other than any of the above) concerned with evaluation of mentors and beginning teachers. In addition, a series of questions was developed as the basis for interviews with each of the target individuals.

In all but one case, each site was visited by a team of at least two researchers. Wherever possible, two people conducted interviews. As is the case with any site-based research,, flexibility marked the actual visits. Scheduling constraints occasionally required that interviews be conducted with two or more target individuals, or that several categories of respondents be included in a single interview.

The actual conditions of the site visits varied. In some instances, respondents were brought to a central location for interviews; in others, the interview process was distributed. In some instances, the site coordinator (who may or may not have been the program administrator) was present for all or most of the interviews; in others, the site visit team was permitted virtually free access to potential respondents. Overall, a range of individuals was included in each of the visits the actual number and configuration varied with the site. The major implication of these variations is that the range of perspectives represented in the case studies may have differed across sites. Although every effort was made to include program critics as well as enthusiasts, there was undoubtedly unevenness across the sites in the extent to which this was possible.

Data Analysis and Presentation

A common reporting format was devised for the site visit reports. Each case study was primary responsibility of one of the team members, although all team members took notes and contributed to the report. Each case study was reviewed by the other member(s) of the site visit team and revised to incorporate the additional perspectives.

The summary report was prepared only after each of the individual case studies had been written, reviewed and revised. In addition to the individual case study reports, the summary report made extensive use of the enormous quantity of program literature provided by each program as well as of the primary site visit notes. The summary report focused on features that were found to be common to the mentoring programs and roles, as well as on the variations among them, rather than on the findings from each site.

Information about the individual sites appears in tow forms in this report: as thumbnail sketches, which appear as Appendix D; and as individual case studies, which appear as Appendix E. The Results section that follows directly after this one offers a

description of the common features across the eight sites. The report then examines the implications of the mentoring activities and the written materials that surround them for definitions of the role of the mentor.

Results

As noted, thumbnail sketches and more detailed accounts of the visits to the eight sites appear as Appendixes D and E to this report. Selected characteristics of the individual sites are summarized in Table 3, below. This section summarizes what was learned about mentors across the sites.

< INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE >

Common features across sites

Nomenclature

As was noted in the initial survey, despite similarities in their function, mentors are labeled in different ways by different programs. mentors are referred to as clinical support teachers in Albuquerque; buddies, master teachers, resource teachers, and coaches (in addition to mentors) in one district in California; teacher consultants in another California district; resource teachers in Kentucky; consultants in New York City; lead teachers assigned as mentors in Rochester; and, simply, mentors in one of the California districts and in Connecticut and North Carolina. In the California district with multiple labels, the differentiation denotes a division of the mentoring function among a series of individuals who are positioned to provide somewhat different support services to the beginning teacher. Buddies, for instance, offer assistance during the first few months of teaching to new teachers in their schools. After the initial period of socialization and help with the everyday details of setting up and supervising a classroom, the support in this particular district is focused more on instruction. At this point, master teachers and resource teachers function, respectively, as models and providers of instructional materials and ideas to the new teacher. In other sites (Connecticut, North Carolina, and Rochester, to name three), the mentoring functions reside with single individuals.

Program philosophy

All eight of the mentor teacher programs examined in the course of this study were related in some way to the educational reform movement of the 1980's. The state programs had been created in the context of legislation related, mainly, to enhancing the induction of new teachers as ways of improving the quality of teaching and the retention of teachers in the profession. Several (California and Rochester are examples) were embedded in larger programs of reform that included additional features like career

ladders for teachers and/or school-based management; others represented direct attempts to improve the quality of teaching, by providing help to beginning teachers and/or teachers in need of improvement. In Albuquerque, for example, one important goals was to enhance the continuity of the preservice and inservice experiences of teachers, especially beginning teachers. In Washington, the goals was to capture and transmit to a new generation of teachers the collective wisdom of an experienced teaching force; having experienced teachers act as mentor provided a mechanism whereby their collective years of practical experience could be shared.

The mentoring program in California was developed as one facet of "a systematic process to recruit more teachers, strengthen teacher preparation, explore the need for induction support for new teachers, refine teacher licensure requirements, clarify the mentor teacher role, and grant teachers greater decision-making authority and opportunities in their occupational and professional lives." (Wagner, 1990) At the same time, mentors served an extremely practical function in districts in which the school population was growing so fast that the traditional mechanisms for launching new teachers were overworked.

Selection

All eight sites have developed and applied criteria for the selection of mentors, and all eight sites have procedures for screening potential mentors. In all cases, a mentor candidate had to be a teacher of some long standing in the district, and had to be a teacher who had demonstrated excellence in teaching. In all sites, mentors submit applications with supporting documentation and in most sites mentors are interviewed as part of the selection process.

One of the problems cited by program people and mentors in several of the sites visited was the fear that the pool of potential mentors was too small to meet the demand, and that the supply of mentors would ultimately dwindle. Indeed, there was concern in several sites that some of the best people were not applying for the positions for a variety of reasons. Not the least of these was the fact that the work is demanding and, in most places, neither release time nor remuneration is commensurate with the time required by the role. The desire to serve as a mentor is clearly a requirement for the position. In some places, this requirement was stated explicitly; in others, it was implied.

Training

All eight sites provide some sort of orientation and/or training for mentors. Most sites provide an initial orientation, usually during the summer preceding the first year of a mentor's tenure. Most sites also provide some opportunity for ongoing training of mentors during their tenure in the position. Across the eight sites visited, the training varied from fairly structured courses, occasionally derived from a particular theoretical

perspective on induction (the North Carolina program and the Teacher Assistance Program in the El Cajon district in California are cases in point), to more as-needed approaches to assistance to mentors (Rochester is an example). Albuquerque offers a good example of an intermediate approach, a mix of predetermined structure and responsiveness to mentors' needs. The training of clinical support teachers in Albuquerque involves a choice of university courses offered to mentors and regularly scheduled meeting times that can be used for discussions of issues agreed upon by mentors or for presentations and/or workshops on topics that mentors request. In settings in which teachers participate in the evaluation process, the training often includes instruction in such techniques as observation and scripting (Connecticut and North Carolina are examples of sites that provide such training).

Across the eight sites, mentors and administrators identified as the most helpful form of support training or ongoing seminars in the area of working with other adults and/or clinical supervision. Another useful form of support that mentors identified wa some forum for sharing among themselves, in which group problem-solving could be applied to particular cases or problems encountered by one or more of the mentors.

Structuring the role

The eight sites differed most in the ways in which they structured the role of the mentor. The most important dimensions along which the sites differed were

- the length of a teacher's tenure as a mentor,
- whether the mentor was remunerated beyond his/her usual teaching for serving in the role,
- whether the mentor served full- or part-time,
- whether the mentor was located in the same building, or taught the same subject and/or the same grade level as the protege(s), and
- whether the responsibilities of the mentor were directly related to the process of evaluating the protege.

Sites also varied in the type and content of the training they provided mentors. Training tended to be related more to the philosophy of the program than to any differences in the way in which the role of the mentor was structured by the program. Except for the inclusion of evaluation among the mentor's responsibilities, the ways in which the role was structured in the various sites had little to do with the functions performed by mentors. Structural differences appeared to affect the relative amount of time mentors spent on each function rather than the function themselves.

The functions of mentors

The most compelling finding from our visits to eight quite different sites was the fact that, despite variations in the structure of mentoring programs, mentors function in very similar ways. While differences in structure create differences in function, these differences were minimal compared with the similarities in mentors' accounts of the ways in which they spent their days. To be sure, mentors involved with proteges in different buildings spent more time traveling than mentors with proteges in the same buildings; and mentors with proteges in different subject areas and grades were less likely to help with subject- and/or grade-specific needs of proteges. At the same time, mentors reported providing the same sorts of help to beginning teachers in much the same sequence. At the start, the help focuses on socialization to teaching at the building level and the everyday details of setting up a classroom and managing it. As the initial year progresses, the focus shifts to more specific types of help with instruction; the provision of instructional materials and resources; suggestions about how to handle specific topics and problems from teaching factions through preparing report cards and managing parent conferences. Finally (and, according to mentors, not all proteges reach this stage during the initial year of teaching), the focus broadens to reflection about teaching and to socialization to the profession at a larger (district and professional organizational) level.

These common functions of mentors are discussed in some detail in the section that follows.

Common features revisited

Although a given mentor might work with one (as in Connecticut) or as many as 15 (as in Albuquerque) proteges; and, although a given mentor might work exclusively with new teachers (as in Kentucky) or with a mix of new and experienced teachers (as in Rochester); the basic support functions provided were quite similar from mentor to mentor.

The functions that were common across sites included the following:

- Socializing the protege into the culture of the classroom, the school, the district and the profession

- Modeling appropriate teaching by teaching in the protege's class or by inviting the protege to observe the mentor teaching

- Providing instructional resources for the protege, including instructional materials or sources of such materials; ideas or sources of such ideas to address specific instructional needs identified by the protege, the mentor, or an administrator or evaluator

- Providing advice and assistance to the protege in non-instructional matters such as classroom management, the preparation of report cards, handling parent conferences, and relations with school administrators

- Observing the protege and providing feedback and suggestions about the protege's teaching or offering solutions to specific problems defined by the protege, the mentor, or an administrator or evaluator

- Meeting with proteges or groups of proteges to discuss common concerns or solve common problems

- Encouraging the protege in the face of minor failures

- Acting as a sounding board and confidante to the protege in matters directly and indirectly related to teaching and, frequently, personal and family matters as well

- Arranging for and/or accompanying the protege to workshops, classes, meetings or conferences designed to help the protege with some aspect of his/her teaching

- Serving as an intermediary for the protege with school, district or program administrators

- Meeting with school administrators about individual proteges or issues related to the conditions of teaching in the school

- Meeting with other mentors or program administrators for purposes of problem-solving, scheduling or program adjustment to meet protege or school needs

- (Infrequent, but important) Counseling individuals to choose alternative careers outside of teaching

- Completing paperwork related to mentoring functions performed and/or the progress of the protege

All of the mentors reported a heavy load of paperwork. The nature of the paperwork appeared to depend on the official functions of the mentor as assigned by the district or program, and tended to be heaviest in districts in which mentors participated in the evaluation process for beginning teachers. In such programs (Connecticut and the Poway School District are examples), the evaluation process almost always involved multiple forms and the need to complete the forms within tight deadlines.

The mentors interviewed for this study also said many of the same things about the process and sequence of the mentoring function. At the outset, new teachers appear to need help with specific, mundane functions. These include things like finding the storeroom, learning to use the copying machine, and meeting other teachers in the building. Beginning teachers also need help setting up their classrooms. The role of the mentor at the outset is to provide help with immediate and specific needs and to help to alleviate the anxiety involved in facing a class for the first few weeks. Once the basic needs are met, mentors said that their attention turns to immediate instructional and management concerns: how to prepare a lesson plan in this school, what materials to use for particular topics, how to regroup when a particular lesson fails, how to handle disruptive students. Only after some time does the mentor-protege relationship focus on some of the larger concerns of teaching and of the profession.

In discussing the qualities that are required of mentors, all mentors (and many program administrators) cited an ability to work well with adults. Many of the mentors interviewed claimed that they had *teamed on the job that being a good and respected teacher did not necessarily transfer to being a good mentor. The requirement most commonly cited by mentors themselves was flexibility, the ability to change approaches based on the needs and stage of development of a particular protege. Following flexibility in frequency were such characteristics as energy, enthusiasm, a love of teaching and people, and empathy. And many added that a sense of humor was a major asset.

Variations on common features

As noted above, variations on the mentor role depended very much on the structure provided by the program. In settings in which mentors served proteges on an individual (one-to-one) basis, some of the personal counseling functions were performed with greater frequency than in cases in which a mentor served up to 15 proteges. In programs in which the mentor function was divided (El Cajon, New York City and North Carolina are examples), different people performed the functions listed. Nonetheless, the listed functions were performed.

Similar variations, mainly in the frequency with which particular functions were performed, revolved around the same-building, different-building difference. In programs that required mentor and protege to be located in the same building, mentors tended to provide more immediate and specific help to proteges; where mentors were located outside of the buildings, proteges tended to solve immediate problems themselves and present mentors with questions that were more general and/or recurring. Depending upon whether a mentor taught at the same grade level and/or in the same subject area as the protege, the kind of instructional and/or management assistance might be more or less specific. And in instances of one mentor to many proteges, the mentor was likely to be required to confront a greater range of challenges within a given school year.

Finally, mentors who participated in the evaluation process performed an

additional set of functions that were not included in the jobs of mentors who did not have a role in evaluation. The evaluation function invariably required attention to a particular set of requirements included in the assessment instrument or process for the district or state. The evaluation functions were also subsumed under a number of the functions listed above: observing the protege and providing feedback; meeting with the mentor and with other individuals to discuss the evaluation; and completing paperwork related to the evaluation. Presumably, the specific behaviors and objectives of particular evaluation processes were related to the requirements of good teaching; only the emphasis changed from location to location.

Evaluation

Programs differed considerably in the extent to which and the ways in which mentors and/or programs of mentoring are evaluated. Most of the sites collect valuative information about their offerings in the training of mentors. Most also collect some data via questionnaire from proteges about their perceptions of the mentoring they received. Several programs (Connecticut is an example) had plans to collect system-wide comparative data related to the evaluation and retention of new teachers prior to and subsequent to the introduction of the program.

At least three sites, each of them programs of more than two years' duration, had systematically collected a large amount of data, most of it in the nature of program evaluation. The New York City program (SESP) had contracted with an institution of higher education to conduct on-going evaluations via questionnaires on uses of the program services and narrative accounts of mentors' experiences. A full-time staff administrator at the district level conducted a systematic evaluation of the Rochester program during its pilot years. And the Albuquerque program, by virtue of its longevity and association with a university, had collected longitudinal data from participants and data about the retention of teachers in the district. California built an elaborate assessment component into its New Teacher Project (Brinlee, et. al., 1990) the initial piece of which was an evaluation during 1989-90 of the first full year of implementation of its program.

For the most part, these evaluations claimed positive effects. Both the providers and recipients of support reported high levels of satisfaction. In California, intensity of both the support and the training provided new teachers and was found to be related positively to their rated performance in the classroom (Wagner, et. al., 1990, p. 12).

The evaluation of individual mentors, where it occurs, typically proceeds on a fairly informal basis. In several sites, proteges or users of the services mentors provide evaluate individual mentors and/or the service. In at least one of the sites (the El Cajon district in California) the proteges' ratings become part of the mentor's file.

Administrators of the programs at the time of our visits uniformly expressed satisfaction with the processes they had evolved for the selection of mentors; the majority of individuals we interviewed (mentors, principals and program administrators) expressed the belief that the selection procedures had been successful in identifying the best of the candidates for appointment to mentor positions. (The sites were divided about whether the best people actually applied to become mentors; there are apparently many reasons why experienced teachers who might make excellent mentors do not apply to become mentors). North Carolina is the only state that certifies mentors. To become certified, the mentor-elect must "successfully complete" three types of training. Criteria for successful completion were not specified.

Discussion

The information provided by interviewees at the eight sites support the tentative finding of the Phase 1 survey that there is a definable mentor role. The Phase 2 findings also support the idea that the role can be described by a set of core functions performed by virtually all mentors. Although there are also some functions that are performed by some mentors, or that are performed by mentors some of the time, there does appear to be a set of common functions that define the role.

The most obvious reason for this commonality is that there is a set of functions that most teachers perform and that have been documented in the job analyses that have been performed of teaching (Rosenfeld, et. al., 1984; Rosenfeld & Tannenbaum, 1990; Rosenfeld, et. al., in press). Mentors serve to assist new or experienced teachers in acquiring and/or enhancing their proficiency in performing these functions in ways that may be predefined or offered as needed. Nonetheless, the functions are similar, and the support provided by mentors is related to these functions.

Moreover, despite seemingly major differences in the ways in which programs define the mentor role and structure it, the actual fulfillment of the role is similar across states and districts. Whether a mentor serves one or 16 beginning teachers, mentors supply the help that beginning teachers need. That help is defined by the kinds of supports that novice (and sometimes experienced but struggling) teachers need in order to develop and expand their repertoire of teaching behaviors, increase their self-confidence as teachers, and become socialized to the settings of the classroom, school, district and profession.

What was not learned

All research has limitations. The choice of a particular methodology implies the foreclosure of others, and attention to certain questions means little or no attention to others. The choice of eight sites focused attention on those sites to the exclusion of others, and the decision to limit the study to the eight sites means that some worthy and

unique programs were necessarily left out.

More importantly, differences among sites and differences in the circumstances at each site resulted in some variation in the quality of information available to us across the sites. It is probably the case that the negative aspects of mentoring are underrepresented in this study. Although it is probably not damaging to the conclusions that can be drawn from our findings, the candor with which interviewees responded to our questions varied as a function of how much the particular visit was "managed." Similarly, the press of time meant that some issues could not be addressed. For example, in Connecticut, it was not possible to visit Bridgeport, a site that had been recommended by the state administrators as one in which the BEST program had met with considerable resistance. We visited, instead, a district in which a school

administrator had been an active participant in the process of developing the state system.

The fact that the functions of mentors were highly consistent across the eight sites reassures us that mentors do perform similar functions across programs with quite different structures; at the same time, we do not know how generally we can apply the observations we made about the relationships between program structure and apparent success, however success was defined and reported by the individual sites. The related issues of evaluation and assessment remain murky in the area of mentoring. While some programs have examined their success with respect to a set of specific objectives (retention in the profession, for example), others have not. And few programs have examined systematically the effectiveness either of individual mentors or of particular program elements (selection, training).

Conclusions and recommendations

There appear to be two related needs that were identified in the course of this two-phase study of mentoring programs and the role of the mentor in the teaching profession. One has to do with documentation for future developers of mentoring programs, the other with a research agenda related to mentoring. While there is a growing body of literature on mentoring, related to the proliferation and growth of mentoring programs across the country, there are unanswered or poorly answered questions that remain, and new questions that will emerge as new issues surface.

One logical next step, then, is to create one or more mechanisms for the transfer and sharing of information about mentoring among existing sites and for dissemination of that information to sites in which mentoring programs are being planned. Interviews with program directors revealed that many had created programs from whole cloth, so to speak, and were anxious for practical guidance. Although a number of functioning programs are based on philosophical or theoretical models, these models do not provide guidance about some of the specific tasks that face administrators: how to select mentors,

how best to structure their work, how to assess the work of mentors, and how to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs. There ought to be a way for programs to share their successes and failures, so that other programs may profit from the (often hard-earned) lessons of others.

A second logical next step is to develop a systematic research base on mentoring. This would involve the creation of a framework that specifies the major questions to be addressed by such a research base, and the kinds of studies that would be best suited to the questions. The framework would be built upon extant literature, the few studies that exist in which some effort is made to examine mentoring from a research perspective. The framework could assist individual researchers in formulating research questions and designing studies that look at the questions raised by mentoring. A good example is the question of effectiveness, especially in terms of some of the larger goals of mentoring.

For instance, many mentoring programs talk about attracting and retaining good teachers, either good beginning teachers or good experienced teachers. It would be worthwhile to examine the question (in a well designed, multi-state study) of whether districts with mentoring programs are indeed retaining teachers at a higher rate than are similar districts without such programs. A related outcome, assuming that a workable definition of "good teacher" can be devised, involves the role of mentoring in improving the quality of teaching. Finally, there are outcomes for the profession that might be examined. These include increasing collegiality and improving morale among teachers; and enhancing professionalism and, ultimately, the regard in which the profession is held by the general public.

Another question has to do with the training of mentors. The sites visited in the course of the current study have adopted a variety of different approaches to training. Some contract it out, others have collaborative arrangements with teacher-training institutions that take on the training function, still others develop their own. Not only are there some research questions about the success of the different arrangements from the individual district or states' points of view, but there are larger questions of effectiveness and cost across programs that anyone interested in mentoring might want to examine.

A third question has to do with the incentives for mentoring and whether differences in these result in differences in (1) the quality of applicants for the positions; (2) the quality of the mentoring that is provided; and (3) the ultimate outcomes for beginning teachers.

A final question has to do with whether the participation of teachers in the process of assessing beginning teachers makes a difference, either to the outcomes for beginning teachers or to the improvement of practice. Although this is a difficult question for which to devise appropriate research strategies, it has important implications for teacher assessment.

References

Barnes, R. E. and Murphy, J. F. (1987). Staff development: Help teachers help themselves...And "peer coaching" is one good way to go about it. Executive Educator, 9(9), 23-29.

Bey, T. M. & Holmes, C. T. (1990). Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Brooks, D. M. (Ed.) (1987). Teacher induction - A new beginning. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Brown, J. G. and Wambach, C. (1987 February). Using mentors to increase new teacher retention: The Mentor Teacher Induction Project. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Arlington, VA.

Brzoska, T., Jones, J., Mahaffy, J., Miller, J. K., & Mychals, J. (1987). Mentor teacher handbook. Vancouver, WA: Evergreen School District.

Busching, B. A. & Rowls, M. D. (1985). Teacher roles in transition: Emerging professional responsibilities for teacher leaders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Denver, CO.

Butler, E. D. (1987). Lessons learned about mentoring in two year teacher preparation-induction programs. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Educators, Houston, TX.

Clemson, R. L. (1987). Mentorship in teaching. Action in Teacher Education, 9(3), 85-91.

Driscoll, A., Peterson, K., & Kauchak, D. (1985). Designing a mentor system for beginning teachers. The Journal of Staff Development, 6, 108-117.

Educational Leadership, 43(3), (Special issue) (1985).

Franceschini, L. A. & Butler, E. D. (1987 November). Fifth-year induction internships and mentor roles. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Mobile, AL.

Galvez-Hjournevik, C. (1985). Mentoring: A review of the literature. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University-Austin.

Gehrke, N. J. (1987). On helping the beginning teacher. In G. A. Griffin & S. Millies (Eds.), The first of teaching: Background papers and a proposal (pp. 105-113). Springfield, IL: Illinois Board of Education.

Gillet, T. and Halkett, K. A. (1988 February). RCSD mentor program evaluation: The policy implications. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans, LA.

Gray, W. & Gray, M. M. (1986). Mentoring: A comprehensive annotated bibliography of important references. Vancouver, B. C., Canada: International Association for Mentoring.

Gray, W. & Gray, M. M. (Eds). 1986). Mentoring: Aid to excellence in education, the family, and the community. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Mentoring (Vols.1-2). Vancouver, B. C., Canada: International Association for Mentoring.

Holmes, D. H. (1986). A study of the Intern-Mentor Program. Washington, D. C.: District of Columbia Public Schools, Division of Quality Assurance and Management Planning.

Huling-Austin, L. (1989). Teacher induction programs and internships. In Handbook of research on teacher education. New York and Reston, VA: McMillan Publishing Co. and Association of Teacher Educators.

Huling-Austin, L. & Murphy, S. (1987). Assessing the impact of teacher induction programs: Implications for program development. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University-Austin.

James, T. L. (1987). Lessons learned: Establishing mentoring roles in two preparation-induction programs. Mentorship as a support system model. Memphis, TN: Memphis State University. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, 67th, Houston, TX.

Jung, J. (1986). How useful is the concept of the role model?: A critical analysis. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 525-536.

Krupp, J. A. (1987). Mentoring: A means by which teachers become staff developers. Journal of Staff Development, 8(1), 12-15.

Miles, M. B. , Saxl, E. R. & Lieberman, A. (1988). What skills do educational "change agents" need? An empirical view. The Ontario Institution for Studies in Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

New Jersey State Department of Education. (1986). The New Jersey provisional teacher program: A second year report. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Odell, S. (1990). Mentor teacher programs. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

A report of the Holmes Group: Tomorrow's teachers (1986). East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group Inc.

Research for Better Schools (1987). Perspectives on teacher induction: A review of the literature and promising program models. Baltimore and Philadelphia: Maryland State Department of Education and Research for Better Schools.

Rosenfeld, M. (1986). Analysis of the professional functions of teachers. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Rosenfeld, M & Tannenbaum, R. (1990). Job analysis as a basis for defining performance domains for the beginning teacher. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Shulman, J. H. (1987). Expert witnesses: Mentor teachers and their colleagues. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research Development. (Sponsored by Office of Educational Research and Improvement.)

Shulman, J. H. & Colbert, J. A. (1987). The intern teacher casebook. San Francisco and Washington D.C.: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Smith, J. J., and Huling-Austin, L. (1985). Professional development: Experienced teachers assisting first year teachers. (Research and Development Report No. 7210). Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, Texas University-Austin.

Sprinthall-Thies, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor training: A working model. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 13-20.

Wagner, L. A. (1986 April). A state perspective on teacher leadership roles: The potential of the California Mentor Program. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 67th, San Francisco, CA.

Wagner, L., Ward, B., & Dianda, M. (1990). Initial findings from the 1989-90 evaluation of the California New Teacher Project. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Weber, R. N. (1987). Mentoring in teaching. Information Analysis. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

Wildman, T. A. et al (1987). Teachers learning from teachers: Mentor's guide for supporting beginning teachers. Blacksburg, VA: College of Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Zimpher, N. L. (1988). A design for the professional development of teacher leaders. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(1), 53-60.

Zimpher, N. & Rieger, S. R. (1988). Mentoring teachers: What are the issues? Theory Into Practice, 27(3), 175-182.

Table 1
Mentoring Initiatives by State

State	State Activity	District Activity	Program Status		*Type of Program	Required of Districts	Linked to Certification	Cooperation with University	Type of Program Evaluation
			Pilot	Implementation					
Alabama	Yes	Yes	1989-1990	1990-1991					
Alaska	No	Yes							
Arizona	Yes	Yes		Fall 1988	A.C. EXP-SUP IND-SUP	No	No	No	None
Arkansas	No	Yes							
California	Yes	Yes		1983	IND-SUP EXP-SUP	No	No	Sometimes	State
Colorado	Yes	Yes	1988-1989					Yes	State
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	1986-1989	July 1989	IND-COMP A.C.	Yes	Yes	No	State
Delaware	No	Yes							
District of Columbia	Yes	Yes		1985	INT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Dist.
Florida	Yes	Yes		1982	IND-COMP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Dist.

Table 1 (con't)

State	State Activity	District Activity	Program Status: Pilot	Program Status: Implementation	*Type of Program	Required of Districts	Linked to Certification	Cooperation with University	Type of Program Evaluation
Georgia	Yes	Yes		1982	A.C. INT	No	Yes	Sometimes Dissertation	State
Hawaii	No	Yes							
Idaho	No	Yes							
Illinois	No	Yes							
Indiana	Yes	Yes		Fall 1988	IND-COMP	Yes	Yes	Yes (Maybe)	State
Iowa	No	No							
Kansas	Yes	Yes	1987-1989	1990-1991	IND-COMP	No	No	Some	State
Kentucky	Yes	Yes		1985-1986	IND-COMP	Yes	Yes	Yes	State
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Fall 1989		IND-SUP	Yes	No	Yes	State
Maine	Yes	Yes	1988		IND-COMP EXP-COMP	Yes	No	Yes	State
Maryland	Yes	Yes	1987-1991		IND-SUP	No	No	No	None

Table 1 (con't)

State	State Activity	District Activity	Program Status		*Type of Program	Required of Districts	Linked to Certification	Cooperation with University	Type of Program Evaluation
			Pilot	Implementation					
Massachusetts	No	No							
Michigan	No	No							
Minnesota	Yes	Yes	1988		IND-SUP	No	No	Maybe	Dist.
Mississippi	No	No							
Missouri	Yes	Yes		Sept. 1, 1988	IND-COMP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Dist. (1989-90)
Montana	No	Yes							
Nebraska	No	Yes							
Nevada	No	Yes		1982	SEE SUMMARY	No	No	No	Outside
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes		July 1974	A.C.	No	Yes	Yes	Dist.
New Jersey	Yes	Yes		1985-1986	A.C.	No	Yes	No	State
New Mexico	Yes	Yes		Aug. 1, 1989	IND-SUP	Yes	Yes	Sometimes	None

Table 1 (con't)

State	State Activity	District Activity	Program Status		*Type of Program	Required of Districts	Linked to Certification	Cooperation with University	Type of Program Evaluation
			Pilot	Implementation					
New York	Yes	Yes	1986-1989		IND-SUP	No	No	No	State
N. Carolina	Yes	Yes		1985	IND-COMP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Dist.
N. Dakota	No	No							
Ohio	Yes	Yes		July 1987	IND-SUP	Yes	Yes	Sometimes	State Dist.
Oklahoma	Yes	Yes		1980	IND-COMP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Outside
Oregon	Yes	Yes	1987-1988	1988-1989	IND-SUP	No	No	Maybe	Outside
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes		1987	IND-SUP	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Dist.
Rhode Island	No	No							
S. Carolina	Yes	Yes		July 1985	A.C.	No	Yes	Yes	Informal Teachers
S. Dakota	No	Yes							
Tennessee	Yes	Yes		1993	INT IND-SUP	Yes	Yes	Yes	State

Table 1 (con't)

State	State Activity	District Activity	Program Status		*Type of Program	Required of Districts	Linked to Certification	Cooperation with University	Type of Program Evaluation
			Pilot	Implementation					
Texas	Yes	Yes		1990-1991					
Utah	No	Yes							
Vermont	No	No							
Virginia	Yes	Yes	1985-1987	Summer 1989	IND-SUP	No	No	Yes	
Washington	Yes	Yes	1985-1986-	1986-1987	IND-COMP	No	No	No	State
W. Virginia	No	No							
Wisconsin	Yes	Yes		1990-1991	IND-SUP	Maybe	Maybe	Yes	None
Wyoming	No	Yes							

*A.C.- Alternative certification: Programs to enable people who did not graduate from teacher training/education programs to get their teaching certificates. Combine academic instruction with classroom teaching experience.

IND-SUP- Induction - support: Programs for beginning teachers which provide technical, professional and/or emotional support through mentors or mentoring teams.

IND-COMP- Induction - Competencies: Programs with all the attributes of the induction-support programs but which incorporate coaching and, sometimes, evaluating based on the state's teacher competencies.

EXP- Experienced teachers: Programs that work with experienced as well as beginning teachers.

INT- Internship: Programs for teachers working toward higher degrees (i.e., Master's) or in-service/staff development

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Attributes of Mentoring Programs by State

State	Purposes	Special Mentor/ Team Training	Mentor/ Team	Stipend	*Release	Full/ Part-Time Mentor
Alabama						
Alaska						
Arizona	Advise Instruct	Yes	Mentor	Yes	Maybe	Part
Arkansas						
California	Assist Retain Guide	Yes	Mentor	Yes	Maybe	Part
Colorado				No		Full
Connecticut	Assist Improve Instruct	Yes	Mentor	Yes	No	Part
Delaware						
District of Columbia	Evaluation Guidance	Yes	Mentor	Yes	Yes	Full
Florida	Support Document Comps.	Yes	Team	Some Up to Districts	Maybe	Part
Georgia	Assist	Yes	Team	Yes	No	Part
Hawaii						
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana	Guidance Support	Yes	Mentor or Team	Yes	No	Part
Iowa						
Kansas	Assist Assess	Manual	Team	Yes	Maybe	Part

Table 2 (con't)

State	Purposes	Special Mentor/ Team Training	Mentor/ Team	Stipend	*Release	Full/ Part-Time Mentor
Kentucky	Assist Assess Supervise	Yes	Team	Yes	Yes	Part
Louisiana	Support Comps.	Maybe (June)	Team	Yes	Yes	Part
Maine	Support	Yes	Team	Yes	Maybe	Part
Maryland	Staff Development	Yes (June)	Mentor or Team	Maybe	Maybe	Part
Massachusetts						
Michigan						
Minnesota	Depends on District	State	Mentor	Some-times	Maybe	Part
Mississippi						
Missouri	Prof. Development	No	Team	Maybe, Up to District	Maybe	Part
Montana						
Nebraska						
Nevada	Training	Yes	Mentor	No	Yes	Full
New Hampshire	Supervise	No	Mentor	No	No	Part
New Jersey	Supervise	No	Team	Maybe	No	Part
New Mexico	Model Supervise	Yes	Mentor	Up to District	Maybe	Part
New York (Rochester)	Assist	No	Mentor	State Reimburse-ment	Yes	Part
N. Carolina	Guide Counsel	Yes	Mentor or Team	No	No	Part
N. Dakota						

Table 2 (con't)

State	Purposes	Special Mentor/ Team Training	Mentor/ Team	Stipend	*Release	Full/ Part-Time Mentor
Ohio	Support	Yes	Mentor	No	Maybe	Part
Oklahoma	Guide Assist Observe Evaluate	No	Team	No	Yes	Part
Oregon	Service	Yes	Mentor	Maybe	Maybe	Part
Pennsylvania	Instruct Guide	Yes	Mentor or Team	No	Maybe	Part
Rhode Island						
S. Carolina	Assist	Yes	Mentor	No	No	Part
S. Dakota						
Tennessee	Assist	Yes	Team	Yes	Yes	Part
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont						
Virginia	Support	No	Mentor	No	No	Part
Washington	Support Guide	Yes	Mentor	Yes	Yes	Part
W. Virginia						
Wisconsin	Support	Yes	Team	No	Yes	Part
Wyoming						

* Release- Refers to release time for the mentors. "Maybe" means that provision of release time is left to the district's discretion.

Table 3

SUMMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITES

Program Name	Level of Program Administration	Date Implemented	Mentor: Protege Ratio	Mentor Serves Full/ Part Time	Type of Protege Served[1]	Release Time & Stipend	Mentor Evaluation Role	Union Involvement in Establishment	Higher Education Involvement
Albuquerque, NM	District	Elem.-1984 H.S.-1988	1:15	Full	BT, NTD, NTS, GI, VT	Release time	None	No	Yes
California	State[3]	1984							
Elk Grove, CA	District[2]	1989	N/A	Part	BT, NTD, VT	Release time & Stipend	None	No	No
Poway, CA	District[2]	1987	1:15	Full	BT	Release time & Stipend	Formative Summative	Yes	No
El Cajon, CA	District[2]	1984	N/A	Part	BT, NTD, VT	Release time & Stipend	None	No	Yes
Connecticut	State	1989	1:1	Part	BT	Release time	None	No	Yes
Kentucky	State	1984	1:1	Part	BT, NTS	Release time & Stipend	Formative Summative	No	Yes
New York City, NY	District[2]	1980	N/A	Full	All teachers who ask	Release time	None	Yes	Yes
North Carolina	State[3]	1985	1:1	Part	BT, NTS	None	Formative (sometimes summative)	No	Yes
Rochester, NY	District	1986	1:4	Part	BT, NTD, NTS, VT	Release time & Stipend	Formative Summative	Yes	No
Washington, DC	District	1985	1:10	Full	BT, NTD	Release time & Stipend	Formative	Yes	Yes

[1]BT = Beginning Teacher
NTD = new to District
GI = Graduate Intern
VT = Veteran Teacher
NTS = New to State

[2]Program serves schools and decentralized districts in a multi-district city.

[3]Districts develop their own plans following state guidelines.

Appendix C

QUESTIONS FOR SITE VISITS

These questions formed the core of our information-gathering process. Separate interview guides were developed for different categories of respondents. At the same time, we have recognized the need to maintain some degree of fluidity and flexibility in our interviewing process. Wherever it was possible to observe something happening, we asked to do so.

1. Structure and Organization of Program

A. How is the program organized? Where is accountability located?

B. What roles are different individuals (or categories of individuals) expected to play? What roles do they actually play?

C. What impact does this organization have on the way in which the program functions and its success in achieving its objectives?

II. Program Philosophy and Assumptions

A. What are the assumptions and philosophy that underlie the program? How are these related to the way in which the program is structured?

B. What events, conditions, or beliefs led to the adoption of the particular model employed by the site?

C. How are the philosophy and assumptions of the program related to the roles that different participants play?

111. Practical/Material Issues

A. Who funds the program? How is funding related to program structure, accountability, and success?

B. Setting: Are there differences across settings? (That is, does the program work better in some districts and/or schools than others?)

C. Individual differences and styles: How are individual differences (e.g., in teaching style, definitions of professional responsibilities, etc.) handled in the program? For example, what happens if a mentor and beginning teacher simply don't hit it off.?

IV. Evaluation and Assessment

A. How are beginning teachers assessed in this setting? What procedures, techniques and/or instruments are used? What evidence exists that the procedures are working?

B. What are the roles of mentors in the assessment/evaluation process? How comfortable are mentors with these roles?

C. How, if at all, is the success of the mentor assessed?

D. How, if at all, is the success of the program assessed?

E. How well do all parties concerned feel that the program is serving

(a) the needs of beginning teachers?

(b) the objectives of the program?

(c) the needs of the school(s) and/or district(s) in which the program is located?

(d) the larger goals of educational reform and enhancement of the teaching profession?